

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRENT LEE HARDING,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORRECTIONAL HEALTH SERVICES,
et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-00922 KJM SCR P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a pretrial detainee during the events underlying his federal claims, filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He is proceeding pro se. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On August 13, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. ECF No. 60. Neither party has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law


1 by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court
2 . . .”). Having carefully reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations are
3 thorough and insightful, and supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 60) are adopted in full;
- 5 2. Defendant Holt’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 50) is **granted**; and
- 6 3. Defendant Mencias’ motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 51) is **granted**.
- 7 4. The clerk of the court is directed to grant judgment in defendants’ favor and **close the**
8 **case**.

9 This order resolves ECF Nos. 50, 51, 60.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED: September 9, 2025.

12 
13 _____
14 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28